

Appln. No.: 10/089,011

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim 20 has been amended in such manner as to overcome the drawing objection. Figure 1 clearly shows the claimed hydraulic control mechanism 38 as part of the braking system 10 and coupled to front brakes 16, 18 and rear brakes 20, 22 by associated hydraulic lines 42, 44 which, on page 12 lines 1-4 of the specification also represent the path of the control lines for the electronic control system. In other words, either system (electric or hydraulic lines 42, 44) operate the brakes 16, 18, 20, 22. Thus, the steps of amended claim 20 are believed to be sufficiently illustrated by the diagrammatic view of Figure 1. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 14 over Bunker in view of Taig is respectfully requested.

While the examiner asserts that Bunker discloses all of the limitations of claim 14 except for use of an electric actuator, such is not the case. Claim 14 recites the step of controlling the attitude and movement of the brake discs with respect to the wheel hub and controlling the attitude and movement of the friction elements with respect to the caliper to maintain the brake discs and friction elements in parallel alignment during sliding movement into and out of braking engagement with one another. Bunker does not teach this aspect of the claimed invention and Taig does not make up for the deficiency. Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn on this basis alone.

Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion in either Bunker or Taig of providing an electric actuator system that would be effective to displace both slideable brake pads and discs. The single disc 22 of Taig is fixed. One skilled in the art of sliding disc brakes would thus not look to the fixed disc system of Taig for a solution to disc actuation problems or substitutions associated with the Bunker system. As such, the rejection is further believed to be improper on this basis alone and it is respectfully requested that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 14.

It is submitted that this amendment fully complies with requirements for an after-final amendment, as it is responsive to rejections first made in the final action and thus could not have been earlier presented and raises no new issues that would require further consideration by the examiner apart from the properness of the final rejection.

Appl. No.: 10/089,011

It is believed that this application now is in condition for allowance. Further and favorable action is requested.


The Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 04-1061.

Respectfully submitted,

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC

June 12, 2006

Date

  
Robert L. Stearns, Registration No. 36,937  
38525 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2000  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-2970  
(248) 433-7382

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this Amendment is being sent via facsimile 571-273-8300 addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on June 12, 2006.

  
Karri M. Chamberlin

BLOOMFIELD 604080-33 770877v1